A note on the convergence of nonconvex line search

Tao Sun[*,a], Lizhi Cheng[a,c], Hao Jiang[b]

[a] College of Science, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, Hunan, China, 410073.
[b] School of Computer, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China, 410073.
[c] The State Key Laboratory for High Performance Computation, National University of Defense Technology, Changsha, China, 410073.

arXiv:1603.06912v1 [cs.NA] 19 Mar 2016

Abstract

In this note, we consider the line search for a class of abstract nonconvex algorithm which have been deeply studied in the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz theory. We provide a weak convergence result of the line search in general. When the objective function satisfies the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property and some certain assumption, a global convergence result can be derived. An application is presented for the ℓ_0 regularized least square minimization in the end of the paper.

Key words: Nonconvex optimization, line search, Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property, global convergence

1. Introduction

Line search is one of the most frequently used techniques in the optimization community. In each iteration of this method, a positive scalar η_k is computed based on a strategy and the direction d^k is generated by some known way; the point x^{k+1} is then updated by the following scheme

$$x^{k+1} = x^k + \eta_k d^k. \tag{1}$$

However, the difficulty of calculating d^k and η_k are quite different. It is usually more difficult to compute d^k. Mathematicians have been in search of more efficient strategy for d^k, which leads to the development of various quasi-Newton methods [5]. While η_k is routinely obtained by the well-known Armijo search.

In this paper, we consider the line search of some "basic algorithm" (*We call it as Algorithm B through the paper*) for the following optimization problem

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi(x), \tag{2}$$

where $\Phi : \mathbb{R}^N \to \mathbb{R}$ may be nonconvex and nonsmooth which satisfies that $\inf_x \Phi(x) > -\infty$. In the paper, two important assumptions about the sequence $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\ldots}$ generated by Algorithm B are vital to the analysis.

A.1 There exist $\nu > 0$ such that $\Phi(x^{k+1}) \le \Phi(x^k) + \nu\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$.

A.2 There exist $\beta > 0$ such that $\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\Phi(x^{k+1})) \le \beta\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, where $\partial\Phi(x^{k+1})$ denotes the set of limiting subdifferential of Φ at x^{k+1} (see Section 2 for a detailed definition).

Actually, various algorithms obey **A.1** and **A.2**; specific examples are given in [1, 3]. It is also proved that Algorithm B converges to a critical point of the objective function under the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property assumption[1]. In the k-th iteration, we consider the line search as

Step 1 Use x^k to generate y^k by Algorithm B.

Step 2 Set $d^k = y^k - x^k$. Find m_k as the smallest integer number m which obeys that

$$\Phi(y^k + \eta^m d^k) \le \Phi(y^k) - \alpha\eta^m\|d^k\|_2^2, \tag{3}$$

*Corresponding author
Email addresses: nudtsuntao@163.com (Tao Sun), clzcheng@nudt.edu.cn (Lizhi Cheng), haojiang@nudt.edu.cn (Hao Jiang)

where $\alpha > 0$ and $0 < \eta < 1$ are parameters (Armijo search). Set $\eta_k = \eta^{m_k}$ if $m_k \leq M$ and $\eta_k = 0$ if $m_k > M$, where $M \in \mathbb{N}$ is a parameter. The point x^{k+1} is generated by

$$x^{k+1} = x^k + (\eta_k + 1)d^k. \tag{4}$$

The specific scheme of **Step 1** depends on the scheme of Algorithm B. For example, if Algorithm B is the gradient descend method, $y^k = x^k - h\nabla f(x^k)$; if Algorithm B is the forward-backward method, $y^k = \mathbf{Prox}_g[x^k - h\nabla f(x^k)]$. The Armijo search may not always succeed because $\Phi(y^k)$ can be the minimum over $\{y^k + td^k | t \in \mathbb{R}\}$. Therefore, we introduce the parameter M.

Algorithm 1 Algorithm B with line search

Require: parameters $\alpha > 0$, $0 < \eta < 1$, $M \in \mathbb{N}$
Initialization: x^0
for $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$
Use x^k to generate y^k by Algorithm B and set $d^k = y^k - x^k$
Find m_k as the smallest integer number m which obeys that $\Phi(y^k + \eta^m d^k) \leq \Phi(y^k) - \alpha\eta^m \|d^k\|_2^2$
Set $\eta_k = \eta^{m_k}$ if $m_k \leq M$ and $\eta_k = 0$ if $m_k > M$
$x^{k+1} = x^k + (\eta_k + 1)d^k$
end for

In this paper, we consider a line search strategy for a class of abstract algorithms which obey several certain assumptions. We prove that any accumulation point of the generated iterations is a critical point of the objective function. If the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property and another reasonable assumption are access for the objective function, a global convergence result can be presented.

The rest of this paper is organized as follows. Section 2 introduces the preliminaries. Section 3 proves the convergence. Section 4 considers an application. Section 5 concludes the paper.

2. Preliminaries

We collect several definitions as well as some useful properties in variational and convex analysis. Given a lower semicontinuous function $J : \mathbb{R}^N \to (-\infty, +\infty]$, its domain is defined by

$$dom(J) := \{x \in \mathbb{R}^N : J(x) < +\infty\}.$$

The graph of a real extended valued function $J : \mathbb{R}^N \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ is defined by

$$\text{graph}(J) := \{(x, v) \in \mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R} : v = J(x)\}.$$

The notation of subdifferential plays a central role in (non)convex optimization.

Definition 2.1 (subdifferentials[4, 7])**.** Let $J : \mathbb{R}^N \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ be a proper and lower semicontinuous function.

1. For a given $x \in dom(J)$, the Fréchet subdifferential of J at x, written as $\hat{\partial}J(x)$, is the set of all vectors $u \in \mathbb{R}^N$ which satisfy
$$\liminf_{y \neq x \; y \to x} \frac{J(y) - J(x) - \langle u, y - x\rangle}{\|y - x\|_2} \geq 0.$$
When $x \notin dom(J)$, we set $\hat{\partial}J(x) = \emptyset$.
2. The (limiting) subdifferential, or simply the subdifferential, of J at $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$, written as $\partial J(x)$, is defined through the following closure process
$$\partial J(x) := \{u \in \mathbb{R}^N : \exists x^k \to x, J(x^k) \to J(x) \text{ and } u^k \in \hat{\partial}J(x^k) \to u \text{ as } k \to \infty\}.$$

It is easy to verify that the Fréchet subdifferential is convex and closed while the subdifferential is closed. When J is convex, the definition agrees with the one in convex analysis [6] as

$$\partial J(x) := \{v : J(y) \geq J(x) + \langle v, y - x\rangle \text{ for any } y \in \mathbb{R}^N\}.$$

Let $\{(x^k, v^k)\}_{k\in\mathbb{N}}$ be a sequence in $\mathbb{R}^N \times \mathbb{R}$ such that $(x^k, v^k) \in \text{graph}\,(\partial J)$. If (x^k, v^k) converges to (x, v) as $k \to +\infty$ and $J(x^k)$ converges to v as $k \to +\infty$, then $(x, v) \in \text{graph}\,(\partial J)$. This indicates the following simple proposition.

Proposition 2.2. If $v^k \in \partial J(x^k)$, and $\lim_k v^k = v$ and $\lim_k x^k = x$. Then, we have that

$$v \in \partial J(x). \tag{5}$$

A necessary condition for $x \in \mathbb{R}^N$ to be a minimizer of $J(x)$ is

$$0 \in \partial J(x). \tag{6}$$

When J is convex, (6) is also sufficient. A point that satisfies (6) is called (limiting) critical point. The set of critical points of $J(x)$ is denoted by crit(J).

Definition 2.3. We call J has a Lipschitz gradient with constant $L_J \geq 0$ if for any $x, y \in dom(J)$

$$\|\nabla J(x) - \nabla J(y)\|_2 \leq L_J\|x - y\|_2. \tag{7}$$

Definition 2.4 ([3, 1])**.** (a) The function $J : \mathbb{R}^N \to (-\infty, +\infty]$ is said to have the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property at $\overline{x} \in dom(\partial J)$ if there exist $\eta \in (0, +\infty]$, a neighborhood U of $\overline{x}$ and a continuous function $\varphi : [0, \eta) \to \mathbb{R}^+$ such that

1. $\varphi(0) = 0$.
2. φ is C^1 on $(0, \eta)$.
3. for all $s \in (0, \eta)$, $\varphi'(s) > 0$.
4. for all x in $U \bigcap \{x|J(\overline{x}) < J(x) < J(\overline{x}) + \eta\}$, the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz inequality holds

$$\varphi'(J(x) - J(\overline{x}))\text{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial J(x)) \geq 1. \tag{8}$$

(b) Proper lower semicontinuous functions which satisfy the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz inequality at each point of $dom(\partial J)$ are called KL functions.

3. Convergence analysis

Lemma 3.1. *Assume that Algorithm B satisfies **A.1**. Letting $\eta_+ = \inf_k \eta_k$[1] and $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\ldots}$ be generated by Algorithm 1, it then holds that*

$$\Phi(x^{k+1}) \leq \Phi(x^k) - a\|d^k\|_2^2, \tag{9}$$

where $a = \nu + \alpha\eta_+$.

Proof. Note that Algorithm B satisfies **A.1**, then,

$$\Phi(y^k) \leq \Phi(x^k) - \nu\|d^k\|_2^2. \tag{10}$$

And we have that

$$\Phi(x^{k+1}) \leq \Phi(y^k) - \alpha\eta^k\|d^k\|_2^2. \tag{11}$$

Combine (10) and (11), we can derive the result. □

[1] Obviously, $\eta_+ \geq 0$.

Theorem 3.2. *Assume that Algorithm B satisfies **A.1**. Let $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$ be generated by Algorithm 1, for any accumulation point of $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$ is a stationary point of Φ.*

Proof. From Lemma 3.1, we can easily see that

$$\sum_{i=0}^{k} \|d^k\|_2^2 \leq \frac{\Phi(x^0) - \Phi(x^{k+1})}{a} < +\infty. \tag{12}$$

That means

$$\lim_k \|d^k\|_2 = 0. \tag{13}$$

Note that $\|y^k - x^k\|_2 = \|d^k\|_2$, then,

$$\lim_k \|y^k - x^k\|_2 = 0. \tag{14}$$

Assume that x^* is an accumulation point of $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$, then there exists $\{k_j\}_{j=0,1,2,\dots}$ such that $\lim_j x^{k_j} = x^*$. From (14), we have that $\lim_j y^{k_j} = x^*$. Note **A.2**, we derive that

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\Phi(y^{k_j})) \leq b\|d^{k_j}\|_2. \tag{15}$$

The closedness of $\partial\Phi(y^{k_j})$ means that there exists $v^{k_j} \in \partial\Phi(y^{k_j})$ such that $\|v^{k_j}\|_2 \leq b\|d^{k_j}\|_2$. Note that $\{v^{k_j}\}_{j=0,1,2,\dots}$ is bounded, without loss of generality, we assume that $\lim_j v^{k_j} = v^*$, where v^* is an accumulation point. From Proposition 2.2, we have that $v^* \in \partial\Phi(x^*)$ and $\|v^*\|_2 = 0$ (i.e., $v^* = \mathbf{0}$). Therefore,

$$\mathbf{0} \in \partial\Phi(x^*). \tag{16}$$

□

Lemma 3.3. *Assume that Algorithm B satisfies **A.2**. If Φ has a Lipschitz gradient with constant L_Φ, for any $k \in \mathbb{N}$, we have that*

$$dist(\boldsymbol{0}, \nabla\Phi(x^{k+1})) \leq b\|d^k\|_2, \tag{17}$$

where $b = \beta + L_\Phi\eta$.

Proof. The closedness of the subdifferential together with **A.2** can give that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \nabla\Phi(x^{k+1})) &\leq \mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \nabla\Phi(y^k)) + \|\nabla\Phi(y^k) - \nabla\Phi(x^{k+1})\|_2 \\ &\leq \beta\|d^k\|_2 + L_\Phi\|y^k - x^{k+1}\|_2 \\ &= \beta\|d^k\|_2 + L_\Phi\eta_k\|d^k\|_2 \\ &\leq (\beta + L_\Phi\eta)\|d^k\|_2. \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

□

Remark 3.4. Actually, in some case, Lemma 3.3 holds even function Φ fails to be differentiable. In Section 4, we present the example.

Theorem 3.5 (Global convergence)**.** *Assume that Algorithm B satisfies **A.1** and **A.2**. If Φ is a KL function and has a Lipschitz gradient with constant L_Φ. Let $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$ generated by Algorithm 1 be bounded, then, $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$ globally converges to a critical point of Φ.*

Proof. The scheme of Algorithm 1 certainly gives that

$$\|d^k\|_2 \leq \|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2 \leq (1+\eta)\|d^k\|_2.$$

Therefore, Lemmas 3.1 and 3.3 also indicate that

$$\widetilde{a}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2^2 \leq \Phi(x^k) - \Phi(x^{k+1}), \tag{19}$$

and

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \partial\Phi(x^{k+1})) \leq \widetilde{b}\|x^{k+1} - x^k\|_2, \tag{20}$$

where $\widetilde{a} = a/(1+\eta)$ and $\widetilde{b} = (1+\eta)b$. With (19) and (20), [Theorem 2.9, [1]] gives the convergence result of $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\dots}$. □

4. Application

This part consider the application to the ℓ_0 regularized least square minimization which reads as

$$\min_{x\in\mathbb{R}^N} \Phi^0(x) := \frac{1}{2}\|b - Ax\|_2^2 + \lambda\|x\|_0. \tag{21}$$

The loss function $\frac{1}{2}\|b - Ax\|_2^2$ has a Lipschitz gradient with constant $\|A\|_2^2$. Function $\Phi(x)$ satisfies the Kurdyka-Łojasiewicz property [1]. Algorithm B is set as the nonconvex forward-backward algorithm [1] (also called as iterative hard thresholding algorithm in [2]) which can be presented as

$$x^{k+1} = \mathrm{H}_{\frac{\lambda}{h}}(x^k - \frac{1}{h}A^\top(Ax^k - b)), \tag{22}$$

where

$$\mathrm{H}_{\frac{\lambda}{h}}(t) = \begin{cases} t & \text{if } |t| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{h}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

If $h > \|A\|_2^2$, it has been proved that Algorithm (22) satisfies **A.1** and **A.2**. The specific scheme of line search for IHT can be described as follows. Figure 1 reports the function values versus the iteration of IHT and Algorithm 1. We can

Algorithm 2 IHT with line search

Require: parameters $\alpha, h > \|A\|_2^2$, $0 < \eta < 1$
Initialization: x^0
for $k = 0, 1, 2, \ldots$
$y^k = \mathrm{H}_{\frac{\lambda}{h}}(x^k - \frac{1}{h}A^\top(Ax^k - b))$
$d^k = y^k - x^k$
Find m_k as the smallest integer number m which obeys that $\Phi^0(y^k + \eta^m d^k) \leq \Phi^0(y^k) - \alpha\eta^m\|d^k\|_2^2$
Set $\eta_k = \eta^{m_k}$ if $m_k \leq M$ and $\eta_k = 0$ if $m_k > M$
$x^{k+1} = x^k + (\eta_k + 1)d^k$
end for

easily see that line search is quite efficient.

Lemma 4.1. *Let $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\ldots}$ generated by Algorithm 2 be bounded, there exists $b > 0$ such that*

$$dist(\mathbf{0}, \nabla\Phi^0(x^{k+1})) \leq \overline{b}\|d^k\|_2, \tag{24}$$

for k sufficiently enough.

Proof. For simplicity, we denote that $f(x) = \frac{1}{2}\|b - Ax\|_2^2$. We claim that $\mathrm{supp}(y^k) \subseteq \mathrm{supp}(x^k)$. Otherwise, there exist $i \in \mathrm{supp}(x^k)$ such that $i \notin \mathrm{supp}(y^k)$, which means that

$$\|y^k - x^k\|_2 \geq |y_i^k - x_i^k| = |y_i^k| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2\lambda}{h}} > 0 \tag{25}$$

from (23). However, (25) is a contradiction with (14). Relations (10) and (11) give that $\lim_k \Phi^0(y^k) = \lim_k \Phi^0(x^k)$. Note that f has a Lipschitz gradient with constant $\|A\|_2^2$ and $\lim_k \|x^k - y^k\|_2 = 0$. That means $\lim_k f(x^k) = \lim_k f(y^k)$ and $\lim_k(\|x^k\|_0 - \|y^k\|_0) = 0$. Note that $\|x^k\|_0 - \|y^k\|_0 \in \mathbb{N}$, then, $\|x^k\|_0 = \|y^k\|_0$ for k sufficiently enough. Therefore, we have that $\mathrm{supp}(y^k) = \mathrm{supp}(x^k)$ when k is large enough. That is also to say that $\mathrm{supp}(y^k) = \mathrm{supp}(x^{k+1})$ when k is large enough.

The subdifferential of $\|\cdot\|_0$ can be presented as

$$[\partial\|x\|_0]_i = \begin{cases} \{0\} \text{ if } x_i \neq 0, \\ \mathbb{R} \text{ if } x_i = 0. \end{cases} \tag{26}$$



Figure 1: Function values via iterations

Then, we have

$$\mathrm{dist}(\mathbf{0}, \nabla\Phi^0(x^k)) = \mathrm{dist}(\nabla f(x^k), -\lambda\partial\|x^k\|_0) = \mathrm{dist}(\nabla f(x^k), \partial\|x^k\|_0) = \|[\nabla f(x^k)]_{\mathrm{supp}(x^k)}\|_2.$$

Note that IHT satisfies **A.2**, i.e.,

$$\|[\nabla f(y^k)]_{\mathrm{supp}(y^k)}\|_2 \le b\|d^k\|_2. \tag{27}$$

As k is large enough,

$$\begin{aligned}
\|[\nabla f(x^{k+1})]_{\mathrm{supp}(x^{k+1})}\|_2 &= \|[\nabla f(x^{k+1})]_{\mathrm{supp}(y^k)}\|_2 \\
&\le \|[\nabla f(x^{k+1}) - \nabla f(y^k)]_{\mathrm{supp}(y^k)}\|_2 + \|[\nabla f(y^k)]_{\mathrm{supp}(y^k)}\|_2 \\
&\le \|A\|_2^2\|x^{k+1} - y^k\|_2 + b\|d^k\|_2 \\
&\le (\|A\|_2^2\eta + b)\|x^{k+1} - y^k\|_2.
\end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

□

Corollary 4.2. Let $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\ldots}$ generated by Algorithm 2 be bounded, then, $\{x^k\}_{k=0,1,2,\ldots}$ globally converges to a critical point of $\Phi^0(x)$.

5. Conclusion

In this paper, we investigate the convergence of line search for a class of abstract algorithms. The global convergence result is proved under several assumptions. We also consider an application and prove the convergence result in this case.

Acknowledgments

We are grateful for the support from the National Natural Science Foundation of Hunan Province, China (13JJ2001), and the Science Project of National University of Defense Technology (JC120201), and National Science Foundation of China (No.61402495), and National Science Foundation of China (No.61571008).

References

[1] H. Attouch, J. Bolte, and B. F. Svaiter, Convergence of descent methods for semi-algebraic and tame problems: proximal algorithms, forwardCbackward splitting, and regularized gaussCseidel methods, Mathematical Programming, 137 (2013), pp. 91C129.

[2] T. Blumensath and M. E. Davies, Iterative thresholding for sparse approximations, Journal of Fourier Analysis and Applications, 14 (2008), pp. 629C654.

[3] J. Bolte, S. Sabach, and M. Teboulle, Proximal alternating linearized minimization for nonconvex and nonsmooth problems, Mathematical Programming, 146 (2014), pp. 459C494.

[4] B. S. Mordukhovich, Variational analysis and generalized differentiation I: Basic theory, vol. 330, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[5] J. Nocedal and S. Wright, Numerical optimization, Springer Science & Business Media, 2006.

[6] R. T. Rockafellar, Convex analysis, Princeton university press, 2015.

[7] R. T. Rockafellar and R. J.-B. Wets, Variational analysis, vol. 317, Springer Science & Business Media, 2009.